

REMARKS

Claims 1-5 and 7-11 have been again rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as anticipated by Hoffpauir. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Hoffpauir generally discloses an authentication process in a wireless telecommunications network, for example for one subscriber 22 or SS7 (see col. 2, ln. 23 - col. 3, ln. 49 and Fig. 2). The present invention, on the other hand, simplifies the exchange of signaling and call data between two subscribers. More specifically, Hoffpauir discloses a call processor 40 in connection with a first subscriber (mobile phone) SS7 via a resource manager application 58. In this regard, signaling application 56 provides connectivity, for example, between the subscriber SS7 and a public network PTSN. The signaling application is also responsible for performing various functions and providing users interfaces associated with the various parts and protocols that are included within SS7 signals (see, col. 13, lns. 35-45). Significantly, Hoffpauir discloses only an authenticating process for one or more subscribers (e.g. mobile phones) by a network.

In the claimed invention, there is an exchange process for applications or protocols between two subscribers via a network. Specifically, there is an exchange of application programs 100, 110 (signaling/calling) for two subscribers by means of a processor 58 and an operating system BS. And, in one embodiment (claim 2), there is an alternative with two exchanges of application programs for signaling and data processing by means of a processor and an operation system. Additionally, in the claimed invention, the signaling or call processing by the first or second corresponding application program is performed during the first or second execution of application programs whose flow is controlled by an operating system BS. These features are not disclosed in the applied reference.

The Examiner comments, in the Response to Arguments, that Hoffpauir discloses "...the setting-up and termination of calls to and from the subscriber units 22" at col. 14, ln. 58 - col. 15, ln. 2. While the reference indeed discloses this information, it does not teach or suggest the exchange of applications or protocols between two subscribers via a network. Rather, the reference simply

discloses that MSC 48 may coordinate setting-up and termination of calls to and from subscriber units 22.

Claim 6 has been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Hoffpauir in view of Hartmann. The rejection is respectfully traversed for the same reasons presented in the arguments above, and for the following reasons. Hartmann fails to disclose an exchange process for applications or protocols between two subscribers via a network.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If it is determined that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

In the event the U.S. Patent and Trademark office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicant petitions for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Deposit Account No. 03-1952 referencing docket no.449122002000. However, the Commissioner is not authorized to charge the cost of the issue fee to the Deposit Account.

Dated: November 9, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Kevin R. Spivak

Registration No.: 43,148

MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP

1650 Tysons Blvd, Suite 300

McLean, Virginia 22102

(703) 760-7762